

Serial No.: 10/761,743
Examiner: B. Benenson
Title: ELECTRONIC APPARATUS
Responsive to Office Action mailed June 23, 2006
Page 4 of 6

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 23 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks. Claim 1 has been editorially revised to include the features of claim 2. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claim 6 has been newly added. Support for claim 6 is found in Figure 1 as well as lines 4-14 on page 7 of the specification. Claims 1 and 3-6 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Morikawa et al. (US 5,091,818). This rejection is rendered moot by the incorporation of claim 2 into claim 1. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Morikawa et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a single electronic device comprising a plurality of IC's (first IC and at least one second IC) in which the first IC and the at least one second IC are defined such that the at least one second IC can utilize the protecting (voltage limiting) means within the first IC for overvoltage protection due to the recited structure. This feature is nowhere disclosed or suggested by Morikawa et al.

Morikawa et al. disclose only a single discrete IC 10 which comprises a protecting circuit 16 and an internal circuit 15. Morikawa et al. thus nowhere teach or suggest a plurality of IC's (first IC and at least one second IC) that are commonly protected via a voltage limiting means that is internal to a first IC as recited in claim 1.

Further, Morikawa et al. nowhere disclose or suggest that the internal circuit 15 disclosed by Morikawa et al. is an IC within IC 10. Morikawa et al. do disclose that IC 10 has an internal circuit 15. However, even if the IC 10 disclosed by Morikawa et al. includes a plurality of internal IC's, there is no teaching or suggestion that even one of the internal circuits 15 includes a protecting (voltage limiting) circuit. Further, although Morikawa et al. disclose a single discrete IC 10 that includes a protecting circuit 16 and

Serial No.: 10/761,743
Examiner: B. Benenson
Title: ELECTRONIC APPARATUS
Responsive to Office Action mailed June 23, 2006
Page 5 of 6

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 23 2006

an internal circuit 15, it is not reasonable to equate the internal circuit 15 to the IC 20 as disclosed for one embodiment of the claimed invention depicted in Figure 1, since it is common knowledge among those skilled in the art that a discrete IC generally requires its own protection circuit (for design flexibility) so that it can be combined with other types of discrete IC circuits.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Morikawa et al. Claims 3-6 are also patentable over Morikawa et al. since they depend from claim 1 that is allowable. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the reference to the features of these claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Morikawa et al. in view of Kawamoto (US 6,762,461).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the same reasons discussed above regarding the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 3. Kawamoto does not remedy the deficiencies of Morikawa et al. Claim 4 is patentable over Morikawa et al., alone or in combination with Kawamoto, since it depends from claim 1 that is allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Morikawa et al. in view of Chen (US Patent Application 10/272,061).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the same reasons discussed above regarding the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 3. Chen does not remedy the deficiencies of Morikawa et al. Claim 4 is patentable over Morikawa et al., alone or in combination with Chen, since it depends from claim 1 that is allowable.

Serial No.: 10/761,743
Examiner: B. Benenson
Title: ELECTRONIC APPARATUS
Responsive to Office Action mailed June 23, 2006
Page 6 of 8

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' primary attorney-of-record, Douglas P. Mueller (Reg. No. 30,300), at (612) 455-3804.



Dated: 10/23/06

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/dnh